



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/548,048 10/25/95 CARSON

G 4914.0007-02

CHATT, N EXAMINER

A3M1/0405

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT
AND DUNNER
1300 I STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3315

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1312

S

1312

DATE MAILED: 04/05/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.
for restriction purposes

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☒ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 25-41 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☐ Claims _____ are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☒ Claims 25-41 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

1. Applicant has requested a new statutory period for the restriction election requirement as the original restriction election requirement included inadvertent typo's with respect to the grouping of claims. Claims 25-28 represent claims drawn to a method of manufacture and claims 29-41 relate to an exchange apparatus. A corrected restriction election requirement is below:

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 25-28, drawn to a method of manufacture, classified in Class 156, subclass 196.

II. Claims 29-41, drawn to an apparatus, classified in Class 422, subclass 46.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(e)). In this case the exchanger can be made by a materially different process such as by attaching the pleats of the membrane by welding, brazing, potting, soldering and casting and need not be melted as set forth by the Group I claims.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter; the search for Group I is not required for Group II restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Gersen Panitch on April 3, 1996 to request an

oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nina Bhat whose telephone number is (703) 308-3879.

NB
April 9, 1996

NBhat
NINA BHAT
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1800